

pretty dresses for official parties and those in contact with foreigners—Intourist interpreters and so on—manage to get a smart weekly hairdo.

The question now is what the newly open China will make of Western visitors, and what the Chinese will make of the West. On the aircraft returning to Karachi, my Chinese neighbor looked curiously at the cigarettes offered by the Pakistan airline, embossed with the British royal arms.

Karachi Airport, with its confusion and emaciated porters, must have fulfilled the textbook picture of a country ripe for communism. Will the new leaders of countries like Pakistan be able to match Chinese political dedication, order, and economic self-discipline?

Hon. George H. Mahon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 18, 1964

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, the noted columnist, William S. White, has written a beautiful tribute to our colleague, the gentleman from Texas, Hon. GEORGE H. MAHON—the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations.

Congressman MAHON who quietly goes about his job in an efficient manner is being recognized and properly so as one of the most able and distinguished Members of the Congress. He is praised not only as an indispensable "nice guy" but a gentleman and statesman.

Under unanimous consent, I include this article in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The article follows:

ALL NICE GUYS DON'T FINISH LAST
(By William S. White)

Not even in politics do nice guys always finish last. For distinguished evidence of this there is Representative GEORGE MAHON, of Texas, who has just ascended to the chairmanship of the House Appropriations Committee in succession to the late Clarence Cannon, of Missouri.

For more than 20 years Mr. MAHON has been a significant Member of Congress. For most of these years he has had a responsible hand in the allocation of countless billions of dollars and a critical and decisive role in defense appropriations alone running to more than \$450 billion.

For a decade, at least, he has been among the 10 or 12 men who really run Congress, as head of the appropriations subcommittee which has the military directly in its charge. Now, as chairman of the entire committee, his writ runs everywhere and he is unquestionably among the topmost six of Congress.

DOES JOB QUIETLY

In spite of it all, he has been Mr. Anonymous, quietly doing his job, bearing a staggering responsibility for the military safety of this Nation and its allies around the world, and never making the headlines. Ask the first six people you meet to tell you who is GEORGE MAHON and from all six you will very likely get the reply: "Who, indeed?"

Mr. MAHON, a tall, shy, reticent and soft-spoken man of 63 who at a glance could pass for 45, is a leathery product of west Texas who could easily be either the fellow in the white hat or the black hat in any Dodge City of television. His simple, undemanding demeanor masks one of the wisest and most

sophisticated minds in the United States in the strategic fundamentals of warfare as seen from the ultimately controlling vantage point held by such political masters of all high strategy.

It is said of him, and rightly so, that he knows the byways of the Pentagon far better than any Secretary of Defense we have ever had—because while Secretaries come and go Mr. MAHON has stayed on and on.

Still, if you met him you might think him a reserved country schoolteacher or, possibly, a sedate rancher in town to see the banker about a loan. It is the Mahons of Congress—the quiet, little-noticed, deeply responsible men who are content with the power and never mind the pomp and publicity—who are its last and best justification.

Mr. MAHON is never seen at the glittering Washington parties. Celebrated hostesses know him not. Nor is he invited to the intimate affairs of the diplomatic and bureaucratic sets. They, too, know him not. And the more fools they, for within the modest seven-gallon setstetson he wears is a capacity for real decision over real matters a hundred-fold greater than in the more socially aggressive guests who are in the curious order of things, asked in his stead.

In reality, Mr. MAHON to, say, an Assistant Secretary of State, is about what a commanding general of an Army group is to an aide de camp wearing his shoulder cord over the gilt bars of a second lieutenant. But reality escapes many people here—and this is fine with such as GEORGE MAHON. For they have the work to do.

JUSTIFICATION OF FACTS

Moreover, the Mahons as a class, and GEORGE MAHON specifically, are also the last and best justifications of the very two congressional facts of life now under the widest attack from reformers: The seniority system and the one-party system believed by many to be so notably evil.

But for the seniority system mere personal, popularity polls and log-rolling, and not the hard competence that can only come from long experience, would choose the committee chairmen of Congress. And but for the one-party system, with all its faults, men like GEORGE MAHON could never survive long enough to reach that place of power from which the Mahons alone are able to disregard the little local pressures and passing hysterias and so to concentrate on the great and timeless national issues.

At this point they are in fact statesmen; and only politicians some of the time and then only incidentally. They are nice guys, yes; but they are something far more. They are indispensable guys.

More on Beef Imports

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANCHER NELSEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 18, 1964

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, an item appears in the May 25 issue of U.S. News & World Report which bears out a prediction which I brought to the attention of the House last month. At that time I referred to a Farm Journal observation that legislative proposals to restrict the imports of beef would be acted on in the Senate only to be lost over here in the House during the adjournment rush.

Now it is pointed out by U.S. News & World Report that "the White House has

no intention of supporting a law that would impose import quotas on beef." Apparently the administration will take no steps to upset the congressional leadership strategy referred to in the May issue of the Farm Journal, and the hard-pressed livestock industry will continue to suffer in the role of a pawn in the political chess game:

WASHINGTON WHISPERS

The White House has no intention of supporting a law that would impose import quotas on beef. However, to appease western Senators, White House strategy is said to be to accept passage of a quota bill by the Senate and then bottle up the measure in the House.

Error Upon Error

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. ROSS ADAIR

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 18, 1964

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, a recent editorial in the Wall Street Journal expressed accurately, I think, the opinions of many Americans with respect to the situation in Vietnam. It is worthy of a careful reading:

ERROR UPON ERROR

Ten years almost to the day after the fall of Dienbienphu, Secretary McNamara is in Saigon—for the second time in the past couple of months. Yet no matter how many high officials visit Vietnam, or how frequently, nothing gets clarified. Except, that is, the continuing failure of U.S. policy.

Though the conjunction of the Secretary's trip was the anniversary of the French defeat is accidental, it could be unpleasantly symbolic. With a far greater force than the United States has committed, the French fought the Communists for some 8 grisly years, and lost.

Vietnam was then divided north and south, Korea-like, but unlike Korea the border was fluid and not patrolled by large contingents of United States or any other troops. The Communists predictably made the most of their opportunity, first as infiltrators and guerrilla fighters; now they are so strong they can and do attack in force.

Today the French wonder aloud how the United States expects to win at the rate it is going. They are not the only ones; American servicemen and reporters have long been saying we are losing the war. U.S. officials are alternately reassuring and gloomy.

Part of the official attitude appears to be that we are not supposed to win in a formal sense; only help the South Vietnamese drive the Communists out and keep them out. But even this limited objective keeps going glimmering. After all the U.S.-supported fighting, the Communists are said to be in effective control of sizable and important parts of South Vietnam.

In view of that, it is almost impossible to figure out what is the U.S. strategy, if any—that is, how it thinks it can in fact drive the Communists out and keep them out. Not that anyone expects the Pentagon to reveal its war plans in detail; it is rather that the evidence indicates the lack of any plan which promises to be workable against the varied and successful tactics of the Communists.

Not even the commitment of many more American soldiers or the bombing of Communist bases in the north, which has been

May 18

talked of off and on, would be guaranteed to accomplish the objective. In other circumstances perhaps, but not necessarily against this particular enemy, in this particular terrain, with this particular ally.

At the same time the French "solution" of neutralizing all of Vietnam sounds like a proposal in a vacuum, at least for the present. Why should Ho Chi Minh, the dictator or the north, want to neutralize when he is doing so well as it is? Or if he did want to, we may be sure he would see it as a means of continuing the conquest.

We do not rule out the possibility that the United States may somehow some day turn the tide, any more than we rule out the possibility that the realities of the situation may finally dictate withdrawal. But whatever happens, the U.S. involvement in Vietnam reveals a series of classic military and political errors from which it may be hoped the Government will eventually profit.

First, the United States drifted into the war, initially intending only to advise. It evidently overestimated the fighting capacity of the South Vietnamese troops while underestimating the Communist Vietcong.

Second, the United States got into a war where the enemy chose the field. The field, moreover, is extremely disadvantageous for us not only in terms of terrain but of distance from our shores.

Third, it got into a war without allies, even though the interests of many nations are affected. If its allies care at all, they are willing to let the United States do it. Its only ally, South Vietnam itself, has never given an impressive demonstration of a will to win, on the part of the people, the troops, or the successive governments.

To all this it may well be objected that the alternative was to let South Vietnam go down the Red drain, and perhaps the rest of southeast Asia with it. The objection, we think, begs the real issues:

No nation should count on military success, even limited, in the most unfavorable circumstances. No piece of territory is beyond all price, worth any cost, as the French finally discovered 10 years ago after such great cost. And the United States, for all its great power, cannot forever police the world alone and unaided.

President Johnson Proclaims National Observance of National Small Business Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 18, 1964

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, President Johnson, by proclamation has recently designated the week of May 24 to 30, next, as Small Business Week, and called for national observance of the contributions which small business makes to our Nation's progress and well-being.

In this connection, under unanimous consent, I include my weekly newsletter, Capitol Comments, which concerns the important role of small business in the development of America, in the Appendix of the Record.

The newsletter follows:

CAPITOL COMMENTS

(By JOE L. EVINS, Member of Congress, Fourth District, Tennessee)

SMALL BUSINESS WEEK

President Johnson, by proclamation, has designated next week as Small Business Week.

Nine out of every 10 businesses that supply the needs and wants of the American people are small and independently owned and operated.

Our country's 4.6 million small businesses provide about one-third of the Nation's goods and services.

Small business creates a broad source of diversified employment, continuously broadens the tax base of local communities, States and the Nation, and provides consumers with a wide choice of products.

Small business preserves economic freedom through competition, stimulates the growth of individual initiative, generates new ideas, develops new methods and new products.

In short, small business is the vital center of our free enterprise system.

PARTNERS IN AMERICAN FREE ENTERPRISE:

Congress repeatedly has declared that it is the policy of the Federal Government to encourage, assist, and promote small businesses.

As chairman of the House Small Business Committee, your Representative is increasingly convinced that the preservation and strengthening of our private enterprise system requires fresh thinking about the relationship between public and private business.

The momentous changes in our economy, both at home and abroad, make it abundantly clear that there must be a constantly more effective private-public partnership.

Our small business committee membership has always sought to serve, encourage, and assist American small business in the hope that in due course it will become big business. The concept of our committee is that what is good for small business, generally, is good for all business, and good for the public at large. Our committee is not against big business as such; it is rather pro small business.

Congress and the executive branch can be—and have been—helpful to business. And conversely, business can be helpful to the Congress and to the departments and agencies of the Federal Government by coming forward with their particular ideas and suggestions for solving various problems that face industries and Government.

The Department of Commerce and the Small Business Administration are great and increasingly useful arms of the Federal Government, created and supported by Congress to serve, promote, and encourage all segments of the business community.

A feature of Small Business Week will be the annual meeting in Washington of the National Advisory Council of the SBA. This Council is composed of leading businessmen and women in all parts of the country who are familiar with the problems of small firms in their localities. The regional directors and branch managers of the SBA will participate in this meeting with the Advisory Council members—a meeting which symbolizes, and serves to advance our growing American partnership in free enterprise.

Stop Low Rating the Serviceman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE M. KILGORE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 18, 1964

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. Speaker, the following article entitled "A Dangerous Trend—Ridiculing the Man in Uniform," written by Mr. Joseph J. Lombardo, VFW commander in chief, appears in the May issue of the VFW magazine.

The VFW has long been a champion of the serviceman in his effort to obtain a fair pay scale, adequate housing, assured medical care for dependents, and protection of post exchange and commissary privileges. The VFW renews their pledge of support to those in the uniform of the armed services and speaks out against the rash of books, articles, and movies that are holding the serviceman up to public ridicule.

The article follows:

A DANGEROUS TREND—RIDICULING THE MAN IN UNIFORM

(By Joseph J. Lombardo, VFW commander in chief)

One of the most dangerous developments in many years is the rash of books, articles, and movies ridiculing our men in uniform. This is no routine problem.

Rather it is something that strikes to the very heart of our national security.

It is deeply serious because it has the effect—whether intended or not—of holding the serviceman up to public ridicule. This, in turn, undermines confidence in our Armed Forces. Such a trend, if unchecked, could lead only to disastrous results. But the evil effects of such ridiculing efforts also have a damaging effect within the armed services themselves.

Highly publicized, widely distributed books, and movies adversely reflecting on those who are serving our country in uniform could have the insidious effect of lowering military morale. Why this could happen is abundantly obvious. Military esprit and morale stem, in a large part, from a genuine sense of pride on the part of military men in the task they are performing. If the manner in which they are doing their job is ridiculed, if the military man is the subject of jibes and innuendo, both as to his character and competence, the military man's pride in the service he is performing cannot help but be diminished.

We in the VFW are especially resentful and alarmed over this unfortunate trend in books and movies. It is readily understandable why the VFW should be alert to this development. After all, each member of the VFW has seen active overseas combat service. Each man in the VFW knows, from personal experience, the indispensable necessity for maintaining high morale within our services. We know that a sense of respect and appreciation on the part of our citizenry is an important factor in sustaining a serviceman's pride in his profession.

But this present rash of ridicule of the military is nothing new. It happened before. One of the things that contributed most to the unpreparedness of the United States at Pearl Harbor was the antimilitary attitude in the latter years between World Wars I and II. It was during the period of the late 1920's and the 1930's when the Western World was swept by a false belief that World War I was the last war, and there wouldn't be any more wars. During this same period, there was an outbreak of antimilitary writing, the result of which was to cast military men in an unfavorable light. Military service was ridiculed. The impression was created, by so-called literature, that only the "boobs" and those who couldn't earn a living anywhere else went into uniform.

Our Nation, and the free world, are indeed fortunate that there were those who were insensitive to that ridicule. We are free today because there were those like Gen. Douglas MacArthur, Gen. George Patton, Adm. Bull Halsey, Gen. Hap Arnold, and Gen. Archer Vandegrift—to name a few—who had the deep sense of patriotism to serve during those lean years. They had to hold together practically skeletonized forces so that we would have the base for expansion when the war broke, as some knew it inevitably would.